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ABSTRACT

Successfully implementation of strategies is vital to any organization whether public or private. However transforming strategies into action is a far more complex and difficult task which has been a daunting task to most management which has led to high rate of failure of up to 90% of new strategy implementation as revealed by various studies around the world. Public Universities in Kenya just like other public organizations have adopted strategic management. In spite of most universities having various strategies on various programmes, they are hardly implemented successfully. The purpose of this study was to establish the factors that influence the strategy implementation in public universities in Kenya: a case study of Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture (JKUAT). The specific objectives of the study were to establish the level of strategy implementation, identify the organizational factors that have influenced this level of strategy implementation and to identify the external environmental factors that have influenced strategy implementation at JKUAT. To achieve the objectives, the study used descriptive research design in which 50 management staff from the university were sampled. The study used structure questionnaires to collect data which was self administered. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data. The study used Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression analysis to test the relationship between the variables. The study established that the institution applied strategic plan in its management. The study further established that strategy implementation in the institution was high. The study results revealed that allocation of adequate funds was a major factor which largely influenced the implementation of strategies in the institution. Also cited as a factor which influenced strategy implementation was top management commitment. The study revealed that the institution was faced with resistance to change by some of its employees which it overcame by training its employees and through workshops and seminars. The university forced changes in its institutional and structure and culture to fit the new strategy. The study recommends that the institution develop strategies that will ensure success of future strategy implementation. The study further recommends that the institution adopt modern methods of change management which will ensure minimal resistance is experienced in strategy implementation. Finally, the study recommends that running of public universities be made autonomous devoid of any political interference.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION
This Chapter is on introduction issues and includes background statement and research objectives. It also has cases of research questions and the significance of study. The chapter ends with the scope of the study.

1.1.1 Background of the problem of the strategy implementation
Business organizations exist in an environment of competition where they use a number of resources (physical, organizational and human) to compete with other companies (Noe et al., 2006). To deal effectively with everything that affects the growth and profitability of a firm, the managers employ management processes that they feel position it optimally in its competitive environment by maximizing the anticipation of environmental changes and of unexpected internal and competitive demands (Pearce and Robinson, 2007). To remain competitive organizations therefore need perfect processes that respond to increases in the size and number of competing firms. Organizations have therefore resorted to using strategies in their planning and management processes to remain competitive (Ibid).

Strategic management is defined as the set of decisions and actions that results in the formulation and implementation of plans designed (Pearce and Robinson, 2007). Strategic management according to Noe et al. (2006) is a process for analyzing a company’s competitive situation; develop strategic goals and devising a plan of action and allocation of resources that will increase the likelihood of achieving those goals. According to Dyer cited in Noe et al. (2006), strategic management is a process, an approach to address the competitive challenges an organization faces. It is managing the pattern or plan that integrates an organizations major goals, policies and action sequences into a cohesive whole (Quinn, 1980). The main functions of strategic management have been explained by Robbins and Coulter (1996) as identifying the organization’s current mission, objectives, and strategies, analyzing the environment, identifying the opportunities and threats, analyzing the organization’s resources, identifying the strengths and weaknesses, formulating and implementing strategies, and evaluating results. According to
Walker (1998), it is the business strategy which defines a company's plan for its future growth, development and profitability. Strategic management determine the organizational relations to its external environment, encompass the entire organization, depend on input from all of functional areas in the organization, have a direct influences on the administrative and operational activities, and are vitally important to long-term health of an organization (Shirley, 1982).

The key concept in the strategic management process is the term strategy. A strategy according to Druker (1954) and Chandler (1962) is defined as the determination of basic long-term goals and objectives of an enterprise and the adoption of causes and actions and the allocation of resources necessary for carrying out these goals. Strategy is thus according to Ansoff (1965) a means of achieving goals. It specifies the competitive posture of the organization in the market place. Porter (1980) argued that strategy is the central vehicle for achieving competitive advantage in the market place. Hence, the aim of a strategy is to establish a sustainable and profitable position against the forces that determine industry competition. The process of planning and managing the resources using strategy is referred to as strategic management (Pearce and Robinson, 2007). A strategy is simply a plan. It is an executable plan of action that describes how an organization will achieve a stated mission. Organizations often formulate company strategies, product and service strategies, and strategies that drive operational, support and managerial processes.

A number of scholars have described the strategic management process as consisting of several steps (Pearces and Robinson, Johnson and Scholes). Pearce and Robinson (2007) approach identifies two main steps, namely strategy formulation and implementation. Schermerhorn (1989) points out that strategy must be well formulated and implemented in order to attain organizational objectives. Strategy formulation which is also called strategy planning, is the process of choosing among the various strategies just discussed, and adapting them to fit the organization's actual circumstances. In other words, the essence of strategy formulation is to design a strategy that makes the most effective use of core resources and capabilities. Grant (1991) claimed that these resources and capabilities played a pivotal role in the competitive strategy which the firm pursues and these are the firms’ “crown jewels” and need to be protected. A good strategy requires proper prior planning based on valid and appropriate premises. Without
strategic planning, an organization will fail to come up with an appropriate strategy, which may in turn lead to total failure. Pfeiffer (1994) found that human resource practices have stronger influence than financial endowment, technology and firm specific factors such as organizational culture or leadership styles.

Implementing strategies successfully is therefore vital for any organization, either public or private. Without implementation, even the most superior strategy that seems straightforward may fail: the strategy is formulated and then implemented. Implementing would thus be perceived as being about allocating resources and changing organizational structure. However transforming strategies into action is a far more complex and difficult task. Most strategic thinkers are of the view that formulated strategy is best implemented within an organization environment that is supportive of requirements of each strategy. Some of the elements accounting for this supportive environment have touched on leadership, organization structure, organization culture and provision of all other needed economic resources. The role of this climate in the success of strategy implementation is seen in a wide range of literature that advocates for development of organizational cultures and climate for facilitating strategy implementation through programs such as organization development and change, HRM, organization learning and creating of learning organizations. Some empirical analysis relates the strategy implementation environment with the degree of success in strategy implementation. Some studies show that the failure rate in strategy implementation may go as high as above 70% due to lack of supportive organization environment. (Magnusson et al., 2004; Kovacic and Bosilj-Vuksic, 2005; Martin, 1998). In spite of this reality most attention in strategic management has been given to strategy formulation process ignoring the role of implementation activities.(Grudy 1998, Al-Ghamdi 1998, Pellegrinelli and Bowman 1994).

Strategy implementation on the other hand focuses on the translation of the formulated strategies so that each strategy can deliver results that enhance organizational performance. Kotter (1997) is of the view that strategy implementation is relatively more important compared to the strategy formulation due to its connection with organizational performance.

Up until the mid 1980s many public sector organizations in most developing countries and especially in Africa were perceived to be manifestations of inefficiency and ineffectiveness
(McHugh, 1997). Funding was more or less guaranteed by successive governments. The public sector was characterized by rigid bureaucratic structures, organizational life more predictable and the existing culture worked against innovation and risk taking. Strategic planning, management and change were alien concepts, and there was little need to ensure that, in the interests of organizational performance, the organization achieved a “good fit” with its environment (Nath and Suharshan, 1994).

However, in the Kenya like most of the Africa states, more or less unlimited government funding had ended by the close of the 1980s with the introduction of the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) imposed on the government by the donor community due to changing socioeconomic and political forces after the collapse of the USSR. The need for change was also occasioned by the persistent demands for change and value for money by the public (Brooks and Bate, 1994). Alongside this there was a shift in values from traditional public administration to new public management (NPM) (Dunleavy, 1991), characterized by the adoption of private sector concepts and styles (Glynn and Murphy, 1996).

As a result of these developments, majority of developing countries have been pursuing reforms which involve the adoption of a multiplicity of measures intended to improve service delivery. As an outcome of the new public management initiative, public organizations were forced to engage in strategy formulation and undertake often disruptive and unsettling strategic change. Strategic management has become a watchword of public administration in the 1990s (Vinzant and Vinzant, 1996). Over the past decade, public administrators have been encouraged to be “effective strategists if their organizations are to fulfill their missions and satisfy their constituents” (Bryson, 1988). The changes occurring within the learning setting have led many to describe this environment as turbulent. This is coupled with the increasing demand for the learning institutions to produce graduates who meet the market demand besides keeping pace with increasing learners’ demands.
1.1.2 Background of the study scope of Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT)

University of Agriculture and Technology was established in 1981 as an institution with strong and purely technological base, offering specialized training in Food Science and Technology, Horticulture, Agricultural Engineering, Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Civil Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and School of Agriculture and Building Sciences. The initial base of the institution was built on diploma and undergraduate degree programmes.

With the evolution of Jomo Kenyatta College into a university in 1994, there has developed additional faculties such as: Faculty of Science, Institute of Computer Science and Information Technology (ICSIT), School of Architectural and Building Science (SABS) School of Human Resource Development (SHRD), Institute of Tropical Medicine and Infectious Diseases (ITROMID), Continuing Education Programmes (CEP) and Institute of Energy and Environmental Technology (IEET) running programmes up to PhD levels.

The University has established campuses in Taita Taveta, Karen Campus which was formerly Makini College, Nairobi Campus next to Kianda College, The University has also established a campus in Nairobi Central Business District (CBD) Campus next to the TSC Plaza and on Loita/Pension House opposite Barclay plaza and Mombasa Campus offering courses which are market oriented based at the Coastal region of Kenya.

The University has strategically established other campuses in key towns of Kenya that include Kitale campus and Nakuru Campus with first intakes in May and September 2010 respectively. In the spirit of the COMESA and east African corporation JKUAT has also opened Arusha Town Campus in Tanzania. In total, the University has seven Campuses and one college called college of Engineering.

The current JKUAT organization structure as provided for under Clause 11 (1 and 2) of the JKUAT Act, 1994, the President of the Republic of Kenya appointed the Chancellor for Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology who is the head of the University. The President also appointed the Council whose function is to govern, control and administer the University. He also appointed the Vice Chancellor who is the Chief Executive Officer of the University. The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic Affairs), Deputy Vice Chancellor
Research, Production and Extension) and Deputy Vice Chancellor (Administration Planning and Development) have been appointed by the Council to assist the Vice Chancellor in the day-to-day running of the University.

The University Council comprises of distinguished leaders in education, finance, management, science, agriculture, technology, engineering and other professions. This team works passionately towards betterment JKUAT community, the Kenyan people and the world in general through the provision of quality scientific and technological university education. The new organization structure facilitates maximization of human resources capacity and technology towards a broad unity of purpose, with training and research as core functions. It reduces duplication of efforts, encourages speed in the decision-making process and has an inbuilt results oriented performance approach.

In the last four years, the education sector has been guided by the Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005 on a policy framework for education, training and research. The policy is premised on the focus on education as enhancing the ability of Kenyans to preserve and utilize the environment for productive gain and sustainable livelihoods. In addition, the development of quality human resource is central to the attainment of national goals for industrial development. Education is necessary for the development and protection of democratic institutions and human rights. Indeed, the provision of quality education and training is a human right for all Kenyans in accordance with the Kenyan law and the international conventions.

University education is central to national development. The long term policy of the Government of Kenya is provision of a framework for a sustainable, competitive and autonomous national university system. Any strategic university would ride on her comparative strengths as well as focus on reducing wastage through unnecessary duplication. Further, such a university will pursue the development of a diversified financial base and enhanced managerial independence complete with requisite efficiency and effectiveness. Attention shall be paid to issues of relevance, responsiveness to the market and to national priorities.
1.2 Statement of Problem

Many organizations face significant difficulties with regards to strategy implementation process (Hrebiniak, 2006; Noble, 1999). As Noble (1999) notes, most organizations’ best-formulated strategies fail to produce superior performance for the firm due to poor implementation. Results from several studies have confirmed this view: A study by Allio (2005) found that a discouraging 57 percent of firms were unsuccessful at executing strategic initiatives over the past three years in 2004. According to the White Paper of Strategy Implementation of Chinese Corporations (2006), strategy implementation has become “the most significant management challenge which all kinds of corporations face at the moment”. The survey reported in that white paper indicates that 83 percent of the surveyed companies failed to implement their strategy smoothly. According to Atkinson (2006), more than 50 percent of the new strategies developed by organizations in Europe are not implemented. Farias and Johnson (2000) found out in their study that only about 50 percent of all large-scale change interventions are successful. The high failure rate in implementation as discussed above calls for need to investigate the factors that influence the strategy implementation in organizations with the aim of finding the roles played by these factors in the high failure rate of strategy implementation.

In Kenya the trend is no different. Strategy formulation in the country is as old as the country’s independence, yet the country has still lagged behind in various areas of development and service delivery. For instance in 1965 the government through a Sessional Paper on planning had a blueprint on how it wanted to develop in areas such as revolutionization of agriculture, industrialization and equitable distribution of wealth. However, more than forty years after independence, the country is faced with starvation due to famine, it has not achieved industrialization and has majority of its population living in poverty despite increased number of universities in Kenya over the years. As a result the government in 2003 initiated reforms aimed at improving the performance of the public service by introduction of a strategic plans which was based on government’s development plan in Vision 2030 and Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS). The strategic plan was meant to improve organizational performance through planning, organizing, directing, controlling and coordination of various functions and activities of the organization within the available resources and are focused on attainment of key priority national goals and to integrate it with its external environment besides taking into consideration its future
(GoK, 2003b). Since then public organizations including Public Universities have fully adopted strategy as way of management. In line with the changes in government policies, universities have also re-positioned themselves to focus on Kenyan vision 2030 by reviewing their strategic plans (JKUAT Strategic plan 2009-2012)

In spite of the fact that most Universities have various strategies on programmes, quality research, Innovation, commercialization, Business incubation, ICT among others, they are hardly implemented successfully as the public universities have continuously been accused of producing graduates who have very little to offer to the industry, Some are even unable to write a proper application letter to seek employment. Parallel programmes or Module II courses still face many challenges since first admissions in 1998. The public universities in Kenya have been accused of not leading the country in research, innovation and commercialization as it ought to besides lagging behind in terms of current technology as only a few can boast to have gone fully electronic and attained targets as laid down in the strategic plans. This study therefore sought to establish the factors that influence the level of strategy implementation in public Universities.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of the study was to investigate factors influencing strategy implementation in public universities in Kenya.

1.3.1 Specific Objectives

1. To establish the level of strategy implementation in JKUAT
2. To identify the organizational factors that have influenced this level of strategy implementation in JKUAT
3. To identify the external environmental factors that have influenced strategy implementation at JKUAT.

1.4 Research Questions

1. What is the level of strategy implementation at JKUAT?
2. What are the organizational factors that have influenced the level of strategy implementation in JKUAT?
3. What are the external environmental factors that have influenced strategy implementation at JKUAT?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The study hopes to benefit the following groups in the ways indicated:

**Top management of Universities**

The findings of the study will be helpful in giving insights to University’s top management on factors influencing implementation of strategy. The study will also help in highlighting the reasons for high failure rate of strategy implementation. The knowledge gained will thus be useful in improving the performance of training institutions.

**The Government especially the Ministry of Higher Education**

Government policy makers especially those in charge of Higher Education will be able to get insights on areas that need more attention in terms of successful strategy implementation in the institutions of higher learning for enhancement of better service delivery in public universities in Kenya.

**Other researchers**

The study is expected to contribute to the existing literature in the field of strategy implementation. Future scholars can use this research as a basis for further research in the area of strategy implementation.

1.6 The scope of the Study

The study seeks to investigate factors influencing strategic implementation in public universities in Kenya. The study was done on the seven public universities in Kenya as at 2010. The main focus was Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT). This study mainly focused on the top management of the University including the Vice chancellor, Deputy vice chancellors, Registrars, Finance Officer, Principals of colleges and campuses, Deans and Directors of schools chairpersons and head of departments. As at July 2010, there were fifty such officers of which census study was done.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
In this chapter literature related to factors influencing strategy implementation is reviewed and critiqued for identification of gaps. Reviewed literature included the concept of strategy, strategy implementation, funding and top management commitment, organizational change, organizational culture and organizational structure.

2.2 Review of Past Studies

2.2.1 The Concept of Strategy
According to Glueck (1984), strategy is the unified, comprehensive and integrated plan that relates the strategic advantage of the firm to the challenges of the environment and is designed to ensure that basic objectives of the enterprise are achieved through proper implementation process. The concept of strategy has grown in importance among management scholars and practitioners since 1950s. The importance of this concept has been underscored by various leading management scholars and practitioners such as Porter (1980), Ansoff (1987), and Harvey-Jones (1987).

However different authors have defined “strategy” in different ways. Some define the concept broadly to include both goals and means of achieving them. These include Chandler (1962), Andrews (1971), Chaffee (1985). Others define strategy narrowly by including only the means to achieving the goals. These includes Ansoff (1965), Hofer and Schendel (1978), Glueck and Jauch (1984). The various definitions suggest that the authors gave selective attention to aspects of strategy, which are all relevant to our understanding of the concept.

Chandler (1962) considered strategy as a means of establishing the purpose of a company by specifying its long-term goals and objectives, action plans and resource allocation patterns to achieve set goals and objectives. Andrews (1971) brought together the views of Drucker (1954) and Chandler (1962) in defining strategy. To him, strategy is the pattern of major objectives,
purposes or goals and essential policies and plans for achieving these, stated in such a way as to define what business the company is in or is to be in and the kind of company it is or is to be. In this definition, Andrews (1971) introduces an additional dimension that strategy deals with the definition of the competitive domain of the company.

Strategies go first though planning then implementation processes. Different writers have defined the concept of strategic planning from several points of view. Naylor (1970) defines strategic planning as a long range planning with time horizon of 3-5 years. Heifer (1976) on the other hand suggests that strategic planning is concerned with the development of a match between organizations’ capabilities and the risks present in its environment. In their definition, Litschent and Nicholson (1968) view strategic planning as the highest level of decision making concerning a company’s basic direction and purpose in order to assure long term health and vitality of the organization.

According to Steiner (1979), strategic plans are formulated either as master strategies or programme strategies. He defines master strategies as basic mission purposes, objectives and policies. On the other hand, he views programme strategies as being concerned with acquisition, use and disposition of resources for specific projects. Mintzberg (1994) observes that corporate strategic planning faces a number of challenges: cultural web, organizational structure, uncertainty and learning organization, division of responsibility, the time challenge of implementation and the process itself.

2.2.2 Strategy Implementation
Preparation of a solid strategic plan is no longer enough to ensure profitable success unless it links virtually every internal and external operations of an organization with a focus on customer needs (De Feo and Janssen, 2001). Successful strategy implementation is important to any organization. Beer et al. (1990), and Woolridge and Floyd (1990) emphasized that the strategy implementation could be more difficult than thinking up a good strategy. Harrison and Pelletier (1998) explained that the real value of a decision surfaced only after the implementation of a decision. In other words, it will not be enough to select a good decision and effective results will not be attained unless the decision is adequately implemented (Tan, 2004).
There is no universally accepted definition of “strategy implementation”. Nevertheless, Tan (2004) has identified three distinct conceptions of the term: process, behavior and hybrid perspectives. Implementation is the process that turns plans into action assignments and ensures that such assignments are executed in a manner that accomplishes the plan’s stated objectives. Kotler (1984) cited in Noble (1999). Implementation was found to be a highly complex and interactive process with many variables impinging upon it more of a spring than a simple cascade.


Implementation is defined as the sum total of the activities and choices required for the execution of a strategic plan…the process by which strategies and policies are put into action (Wheelen and Hunger (1992) cited in Smith & Kofron, 1996). In the instances where plans, strategies, technologies, or programs are markedly new to the firm, implementation appears to involve organizational design reconfiguration i.e., a redesign of structure, systems, process, people, and rewards (Galbraith & Kazanjian (1988) cited in Sashittal & Wilemon, 1996).

Wessel (1993) stated that there were mostly individual barriers to strategy implementation such as too many and conflicting priorities, insufficient top management commitment, organizational structure, inter-functional conflicts, poor vertical communication, and inadequate management development. Eisenstat (1993) pointed out that most organizations trying to develop new organization capacities failed to get over these organizational hurdles: competence, coordination, and commitment.
Sandelands (1994), indicated that there were difficulties to conjecture the commitment, time, emotion, and energy needed to translate plans into action. McGrath et al. (1994) explained that the political turbulence might be the most important issue facing any implementation process. Lingle and Schieman (1994) stated that market, people, finance, operation, adaptability, and environmental factors play a vital role to long-term successful strategy implementation.

Christensen and Donovan (1998) mentioned that intended strategies would be implemented as they have been envisioned if three conditions were met. First, those in the organization must understand each important detail in management’s intended strategy. Second, if the organization is to take collective action, the strategy needs to make as much sense to each of the members in the organization as they view the world from their own context, as it does to top management. Finally, the collective intentions must be realized with little unanticipated influence from outside political, technological, or market forces.

Peng and Litteljohn (2001) noted two dimensions of strategy implementation: structural arrangements, and the selection and development of key roles. According to Govindarajan (1989), effective strategy implementation is affected by the quality of people involved in the process. Peng and Litteljohn (2001) claimed the quality of people as skills, attitudes, capabilities, experiences and other characteristics required by a specific task or position.

### 2.2.3 Influence of Organizational Factors on Strategy Implementation

#### 2.2.3.1 Allocation of Funds and Top Management Commitment

Strategy implementation is a process where managers diffuse a strategy into a user community (Kwon and Zmud, 1987). Top management commitment is believed to be essential for any strategy implementation success (Dong, 2001; Wixom and Watson, 2001). A plethora of studies have examined the impact of top management commitment on strategy implementation outcomes. It has been found that top management commitment significantly affects user beliefs (e.g. perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness) (Lewis et al., 2003), organizational implementation success (Wixom and Watson, 2001), progressive use of systems (Jarvenpaa and Ives, 1991), and organizational strategy adoption (Bruque-Ca´mara et al., 2004).
These studies, however, differ in their perspectives pertaining to the effect of top management commitment and as a result, conflicting findings have been generated. For example, some studies assume a direct and linear relationship between top management commitment and implementation outcomes (Guimaraes and Igbaria, 1997; Igbaria et al., 1997; Wixom and Watson, 2001), some argue that the relationship is mediated by other factors (Sharma and Yetton, 2003), and some other assume that a more complicated relationship exists (Keil, 1995; Newman and Sabherwal, 1996; Sauer, 1993).

Top management refers to senior-level leaders may include owners, and other high ranking executives and senior-level managers. Several researchers have emphasized the effect of top management on strategy implementation (Hrebiniak & Snow, 1982; Smith & Kofron, 1996; Schmidt & Brauer, 2006; Schaap, 2006). Most of them point out the important figurehead role of top management in the process of strategy implementation. Schmidt and Brauer (2006), for example, take the board as one of the key subjects of strategy implementation and discuss how to assess board effectiveness in guiding strategy execution. Hrebiniak and Snow (1982) find that the process of interaction and participation among the top management team typically leads to greater commitment to the organization’s goals and strategies. This, in turn, serves to ensure the successful implementation of the firm’s chosen strategy (cited in Dess & Priem, 1995).

Top management commitment is critical for the success of any new strategy implementation process (Gable and Stewart, 1999; Stratman and Roth, 1999). Change requires a strategic vision to ensure its long-term success (Aladwani, 1999). In a survey by Zairi and Sinclair (1995), leadership was ranked the number one facilitator of large transformation efforts. Strategy implementation can only be accomplished when senior management is totally committed to the initiative. Management commitment and support is the ultimate strategy that will secure the necessary conditions for successfully introducing the change brought by the new system into the organization. But according to Mahring (2002) too much support may negatively affect implementation outcomes.
Smith and Kofron (1996) believe that top managers play a critical role in the implementation, not just the formulation of strategy. These studies tend to have a somewhat weak empirical (case) base for their prescriptive advice. Schaap (2006) had carried out an empirical study and has tested the following hypotheses: effective senior-level leadership behaviors will be directly related to successful strategy implementation. This hypothesis, however, has resulted in mixed support; those senior-level leaders who have been trained in or studied strategic planning and implementation are more likely to meet the performance targets set for the company. This hypothesis also resulted in a weak confirmation. More empirical research is needed to clarify the role of top management for strategy implementation.

Although the top management may communicate with their juniors what is expected of them, shared understanding without commitment may result in “counter effort” and negatively affect performance (Wooldridge & Floyd, 1989, cited in Rapert, Lynch and Suter, 1996). Some authors take shared understanding by the top management as a commitment. MacMillan & Guth (1985) and McDermott & Boyer (1999) all think that the shared understanding top management’s strategic goals is of critical importance to effective implementation (Rapert & Velliquette and Garretson, 2002). Strategy implementation efforts may fail if the strategy does not enjoy support and commitment by both the top management and other employees. This may be the case if they were not consulted during the development phase (Heracleous, 2000). Alexander (1985) thinks obtaining employee commitment and involvement can promote successful strategy implementation (on the basis of telephone interviews with CEOs). Some CEOs believe that one way to accomplish this is to involve employees and managers right from the start in the strategy formulation process. Involvement and commitment should also be developed and maintained throughout the implementation process. If middle and lower level managers and key subordinates are permitted to be involved with the detailed implementation planning, their commitment will be likely to increase.

One of the most importance of this is that the top managers are essential for securing the required financial and personnel resources (Guimaraes and Igbaria, 1997; Thong et al., 1996). Financial allocation according to David (2007) is a central management activity that allows for successful
strategy implementation. He point out that various factors prohibit effective funds allocation to projects. These includes overprotection of funds, too great emphasis on short run financial criteria, organizational politics, vague strategy targets, and lack of top management commitment to the strategy. Insufficient resources can quickly result in user indifference or implementation abandonment (Ewusi-Mensah and Trzasnyski, 1991; Guimaraes and Igbaria, 1997), and a system implementation without the support of necessary resources often leads to system abandonment (Ewusi-Mensah and Trzasnyski, 1991). Though important, effective funds allocation does not guarantee successful strategy implementation because programs personnel control and top management commitment must breathe life into the funds provided.

The other perspective of top management commitment focuses on the changing level of support in the course of strategy implementation. For instance, prior to structural adjustment programme of 1990 state universities were funded through the exchequer and operated under minimal local competition. The trend changed with stiff competition in search of funding through module II resulting to compromising quality of education. In such case, top managers may continue providing resources if necessary, but should reduce the amount of resources and seek other measures if the project becomes disarrayed. This perspective focused on the tendency for decision makers to persist with failing courses of action (Brockner, 1992). These studies uncover that top managers can contribute to project failures by continuing to provide resources to doomed projects (Keil, 1995), but can also make a troubled project successful by adjusting resource provision and changing project leadership (Keil and Robey, 1999).

Guth & MacMillan (1986) suggest that there are three fundamentally different sources of low to negative individual manager commitment to implementing a particular strategy: low perceived ability to perform successfully in implementing that strategy; low perceived probability that the proposed outcomes will result, even if individual performance is successful; low capacity of the outcome to satisfy individual goals/needs. Middle managers with low or negative commitment to the strategies formulated by senior management create significant obstacles to effective implementation.
Noble & Mokwa (1999) put forward three dimensions of commitment that emerged as central factors which directly influence strategic outcomes: organizational commitment, strategy commitment and role commitment. Organizational commitment is defined as the extent to which a person identifies with and works toward organization-related goals and values (e.g., Michaels et al., 1988, cited in Noble and Mokwa, 1999). Strategy commitment is defined as the extent to which a manager comprehends and supports the goals and objectives of a marketing strategy. Role commitment is defined as the extent to which a manager is determined to perform his individual implementation responsibilities well, regardless of his beliefs about the overall strategy.

The primary dependent variable in Noble and Mokwa’s (1999) study is implementation success, which they define as the extent to which an implementation effort is considered successful by the organization. At the individual level, role performance is a critical outcome which they define as the degree to which a manager achieves the goals and objectives of a particular role and facilitates the overall success of the implementation effort. Noble and Mokwa’s findings suggest that an individual manager’s implementation role performance will influence the overall success of the implementation effort. Both, strategy commitment and role commitment, were shown to influence role performance. However, the most commonly studied dimension, organizational commitment, showed no relationship to role performance in either of their samples. Their results highlight the complexity of the commitment construct and stress that the study of commitment to an organization alone does not explain this complicated variable fully.

2.2.3.2 Organizational Change

Among the issues pointed out by Hrebiniak (2006) as overreaching issues that impede strategy implementation is the organizational change. He notes that managers are often trained to plan and not to execute strategies; the top managers are therefore always reluctant to soil their hands in the messy tasks of implementation. Strategy implementation always creates the need to manage change in complex organizational contexts (Kazmi, 2008). Many of these areas of change are behavioral in nature and are therefore multifaceted and messy in nature. For instance, leadership style changes required to implement different kinds of strategies or the cultural
changes to be brought about to facilitate new strategy implementation are intricate matters that call for careful handling (Kazmi, 2008).

For the successful implementation of strategy the responsiveness of the employees is critical for an organization to avoid the difficulties associated with this change (Al-Mashari and Zairi, 2000). The top management must come up with ways of overcoming resistance to change (Aladwani, 1998). This is possible by identifying and evaluating the attitudes of individual employees and influential groups. This should address such questions as: who are the resisting individuals and/or groups?; what are their needs?; what beliefs and values do they have? and; what are their interests? (Kazmi, 2008)

The answers to these fundamental questions may offer a good starting point in determining the sources of resistance to the strategy. According to the study by Hultman (1979), employee-raise facts, beliefs, and values are good indicators of what may cause their resistance to change. This could well be applied to the context of implementing a strategy. For example, some employees may raise issues about their computer illiteracy, or may say that they have spent many years doing an excellent job without the new strategy. Other users may develop beliefs that their jobs will be threatened by the new system, or that they will not know how to do the job within the scope of such a system. Yet another group of employees may stress values such as the importance of existing power and authority structures, which may be jeopardized by the new strategy.

Management can use the knowledge regarding potential employees to set up strategies that can best overcome employees’ resistance to the implementation of strategy, and to convince as many employees as possible to adopt it (Aladwani, 1998). The management should strive to find an action sheet for implementing the strategy. In an attempt to change the attitudes of employees, management must first try to affect the cognitive component of employees’ attitudes. A major strategy for achieving this goal is communication. One effective communication strategy is to inform employees of the benefits of the strategy. The marketing people usually communicate the benefits of a product, rather than its attributes, to customers, in order to draw their attention and heighten their realization (Williams, 1982). Top management, in the same way, can create more
effective awareness for the strategy by communicating its benefits to the workers. In many cases, strategy implementation failed because of lack of communication (Al-Mashari and Zairi, 2000). Knowledge about what the system can deliver to the organization and its workers can build anticipation for the system.

One must watch out for unrealistic workers’ expectations, which may deepen the resistance problem, thus causing its failure from the outset (Aladwani, 2001). The success of the strategy implementation depends on building a cumulative base of credibility by management (Kazmi, 2008). Another communication strategy is to give a general description of how the implemented will work. In the marketing context, Lazarus (1988) notes that marketers use this strategy to ensure a receptive attitude from users of a new product. Customers are usually reluctant to buy a product if they do not know, at least in general terms, how it operates. Likewise, employees are expected to be reluctant to welcome a system if they do not know how it works. Teaching each of the various user groups how the a new system works is important in creating awareness (Stratman and Roth, 1999). Thus, from the outset, management should explain to the employees how the new system is going to work. For example, management should clarify the general inputs and outputs of the system, determine departments that will provide the data, and define the computer knowledge needed to operate the system, etc. In all cases, it is of paramount importance that the support staff responsible for executing these communication strategies possess adequate political skills (Aladwani, 1999) so that the awareness stage ends up in accordance with the plan.

Training is very important in overcoming organizational change for effective implementation of any strategy. Hands-on training is important for a successful implementation (Russo et al., 1999; Stratman and Roth, 1999). Training offers a good opportunity to help employees adjust to the change that has been introduced by the system, and helps build positive attitudes toward the system. Further, training provides hands-on experience for the employees: they appreciate the quality attributes of the system and its potential benefits.

The organization may also recognize important groups among the employees for instance the worker union officials. Getting the endorsement and support of well-known individuals and
opinion leaders is the first strategy that can be used. Marketers use this strategy to invoke group pressure because the individual feels the need to be accepted by the group (Williams, 1982). Applying this strategy in the context of strategy implementation would entail ensuring the support of the leaders of the influential groups. The management must convince group leaders to effectively participate in the implementation process and make them feel that they are key players (because they are making key decisions) will ensure their valuable commitment. Because of their commitment, leaders of the groups will try to convince their colleagues that the new system is to their benefit.

Another important strategy is careful timing of the introduction of the new system. From a marketing point of view, Williams cited in Aladwani (2001) discusses how introducing a product to a marketplace at the wrong time would result in a disaster for the organization. Further, he states that attitude is one of the critical factors that must be taken into account when timing the introduction of a product. The above described strategy gives top management a clear rule that the introduction of a new system should not be introduced until a positive attitude (i.e. an intention to adopt) is built and sustained among the employees (Aladwani, 2001). For example, do not introduce a new system when a critical mass of employees feels threatened by the system or feels forced (neither convinced nor encouraged) to accept the new system. Solving these problems before introducing the system would help set the stage for success.

Change in strategy often requires change in the way an organization is structured for two major reasons. First structure largely dictates how objectives and policies will be established. He (David) points out that objectives and policies established under geographical organizational structure are coached in geographic terms. Objectives and policies are stated largely in terms of product in an organization whose structure is based on product groups. Hence the format for developing objectives and policies can significantly impact all other strategy implementation activities. The second reason why changes in strategy often requires changes in structure is that structure dictates how resources will be allocated (David 2007). Unless therefore new or revised strategies place emphasis in the same areas as old strategies, structural reorientation commonly becomes apart of strategy implementation.
Change in strategy lead to change in organizational structure. Structure should be designed to facilitate the strategic pursuit of an organization end, therefore follows strategy. Chandler (1962) found a particular structure sequence to be often repeated as organizational grow and change strategy over time (see figure below)

Chandler’s strategy –Structure Relationship

![Diagram](image)

2.2.3.3 Organizational Culture

In the organizational behavior literature, organizational culture has been defined in many ways by various authors and researchers. However, many would agree that organizational culture can be referred to as a set of values, beliefs, and behavior patterns that form the core identity of organizations and that help in shaping their employees’ behavior (Rashid et al., 2003; Lund, 2003; Pool, 2000). Organizational culture is not just any thoughts, values, and actions, but rather the unifying patterns that are shared, learnt, aggregated at the group level, and internalized only by organizational members (Lawson and Shen, 1998). Organizational culture can also be defined as a pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration (Schein, 1992). These values are then taught to new members in the organization as the correct way to think and feel in relation to those problems.
Organizational culture according to Pearce and Robinson (2000) is a set of important assumptions (often unstated) that members of an organization share in common. Organization’s culture is similar to an individual’s personality – an intangible yet ever present theme that provides meaning, direction and the basis for action. In much the same way as personality influences the behaviour of an individual, the behaviour of an individual, the shared assumptions (belief and values) among a firm’s members influence opinions and actions within that firm.

Organizational culture has been an important theme in management and business research for the past few decades due to its potential to affect a range of organizationally and individually desired outcomes such as commitment, loyalty, turnover intent, and satisfaction (Chow et al., 2001). There is also a consensus that organizational culture is a management philosophy and a way of managing organizations to improve their overall effectiveness and performance including successful implementation of strategy. Research has confirmed that organizational culture is able to influence the thoughts, feelings, interactions, and performance in organizations (Saeed and Hassan, 2000).

Managers find it difficult to think through the relationship between a firm’s culture and the critical factors on which strategy depends. They quickly recognize, however, that key components of the firm – structure, staff, systems, people. At present, there is very little empirical literature on organizational culture within the context of influence of strategy implementation that have attracted considerable attention in the organizational literature (Boon and Arumugam, 2006).

Strategy should strive to preserve, emphasize, and build upon aspects of an existing organizational culture that supports proposed new strategies. Aspects of existing culture that are antagonistic to a proposed strategy should be identified and changed. Research have indicated that new strategies are often marked driven and dictated by competitive forces (for instance the ISO) for this reason, changing a firm culture to fit a new strategy is usually more effective than changing a strategy to fit an existing culture. The techniques used to alter organization culture according to David (2007) include training, promotion, recruitment, transfers, restructuring or organizational design role modelling and position reinforcement.
2.2.3.4 Organizational Structure

Since the classic statement by Chandler (1962) that "structure follows strategy," there has been interest in the relationship between strategy and organizational dimensions such as structure. The relationship between the strategy and organizational dimensions has typically been explained in a sequential model where firms decide on a strategy and then put in place appropriate organizational choices such as structure, systems, rewards, and processes that support this strategy (Galbraith and Nathanson, 1978; Govindarajan, 1988; Govindarajan and Gupta, 1985).

The success of any strategy depends heavily on its fit with organizational structure (Chandler 1962; Paterson, 1988). There has been increased emphasis on the importance of organizational structure in ensuring successful strategy implementation (Douglas and Judge, 2001; Shea and Howell, 1998; Waldman and Gopalakrishnan, 1996). Change in strategy often requires changes in the way an organization is structured because structure dictates how objectives and policies will be established and how resources will be allocated (Sababu 2007). The identification of structures that support strategy implementation has, however, been a highly complicated issue. This complication may be due to lack of consensus on what strategy and sometimes to the confusion about which component of the strategy to focus on.

Factors relating to the organizational structure are the second most important implementation barrier according to Heide & Gronhaug & Johannessen's (2002) study. Drazin and Howard (1984) see a proper strategy-structure alignment as a necessary precursor to the successful implementation of new business strategies (Noble, 1999). They point out that changes in the competitive environment require adjustments to the organizational structure. If a firm lags in making this realignment, it may exhibit poor performance and be at a serious competitive disadvantage. Gupta (1987) examines the relationships between strategic business units' (SBU) strategies, aspects of the corporate-SBU relationship, and implementation and finds that structures that are more decentralized produce higher levels of SBU effectiveness, regardless of the strategic context. Schaap (2006) also suggests that adjusting organizational structure according to perfect strategy can ensure successful strategy implementation.
Different strategy types have different requirements regarding an adequate organizational structure (e.g., White, 1986; Olson & Slater & Hult, 2005). White (1986) points out that the fit between business unit strategy and the internal organization of multi-business companies does have an effect on business unit performance. Specifically, business units with pure cost strategies experience higher ROI when they have low autonomy. Pure differentiation strategies benefit, in terms of sales growth, from strong functional coordination (with responsibility for key functions unified under the business unit manager). Similarly, the ROI of cost strategies is, on average, higher when some functional responsibilities are shared.

Olson, Slater and Hult (2005) identify a taxonomy comprised of four different combinations of structure/behavior types, which they label as: management dominant, customer-centric innovators, customer-centric cost controllers and middle ground. These alternative structure/behavior types are then matched with specific business strategies (i.e., Prospectors, Analyzers, Low Cost Defenders, Differentiated Defenders) in order to identify which combination(s) of structures and behaviors best serve to facilitate the process of implementing a specific strategy.

Research on the influence of organizational structure on strategy implementation has rather been theoretical. Moreno-Lozon and Peris (1998) suggested organization to should high centralization and high formalization for effective implementation. They also argued that organization to should have low centralization and low formalization. Jabnoun (2003) also proposed that organizations should have high levels of centralization and formalization. He also argued for using cross-functional teams to ensure process control. On the other hand, Jabnoun (2003) proposed that organizations be decentralized and have a low level of formalization. He also argued for the use of self-managed cross-functional teams to ensure process improvement.

Concurring with Creech (1994), Jabnoun (2003) argued for organizing small. He argued for using spinouts and outsourcing to reduce the horizontal complexity of an organization, and for reducing organizational layers to achieve a flat organization. To balance the negative effect of spinouts on economies of scale, Hunt (1993) proposed the reliance on synergetic networks.
Shea and Howell (1998) argued that the one-dimensional mechanistic/organic scale proposed by Burns and Stalker (1961) was no longer suitable for most strategy implementation. They further suggested that organizations should follow the structural pattern advanced by Child (1972) and noted for standardization to control systems and processes, and decentralization to allow employees to explore with creative process improvement. Sutcliffe et al. (1999) indicated that organizational structure should have standardized operations to ensure reliability of outcomes while being flexible and open to new ideas.

Germain and Spears (1999) surveyed 1,002 American manufacturing companies and found quality management to be correlated with formalization and decentralization. Evidence from the hospital industry also provides support for the need to have both exploration and control for a successful implementation of the new system (Carman et al., 1996). Douglas and Judge (2001) surveyed 193 hospitals. They found that hospitals that exhibited both structural control through standardization, and exploration through decentralization displayed a stronger relationship between total quality management implementation and financial performance.

2.3 Critical Review

The review has highlights several important notions. The top management commitment is essential for the successful implementation of strategy according to Dong (2001) and Wixom and Watson (2001). It affects the belief, progressive use of systems and adoption of the strategy (Lewis et al., 2003; Wixom and Watson, 2001; Brugue-Ca’mars et al., 2004). There is therefore a linear and positive relationship between top management commitment and strategy implementation success (Guimaraes and Igbaria, 1997; Igbaria et al., 1997; Wixom and Watson, 2001). The top management commitment leads to commitment to the organizational goals and strategies hence successful strategy implementation (Dess and Priem, 1995). The long-term success of the new strategy is dependent on the top management. One of the commitment by the top management which is critical for the successful implementation of strategy is the shared understanding. If the top management are committed, they will secure require financial resources (Guimaraes and Igbaria, 1997; Thong et al., 1996). Financial allocation is central management activities that allows for strategy implementation (David, 2007). Insufficient financial resource
allocation can quickly result in user indifferent or implementation abandonment (Ewusi-Mensah and Trzansyki, 1991; Guimareas and Igbaria, 1997)

Organizational change may impede successful strategy implementation. New strategies require organizational change to ensure successful implementation. This is in the areas of both individual and organizational behavior, organizational culture and organizational structure. These are intricate matters which require careful handling (Kazmi, 2008). Successful implementation of strategy require responsiveness of the employees to avoid difficulties associated with organizational change. New strategies require change in the organizational structure to establish how objectives and policies will be established and how resources will be allocated.

The culture of the organization so much influences the successful implementation of strategy. The management should strive to perceive, emphasis and build upon an existing organizational culture that supports proposed new strategy while those that are perceived to be antagonizing successful implementation of the new strategy, should be changed. These may be done through training, promotion, transfers, restructuring or organizational role modeling and position reinforcement.

The success of strategy implementation depends on organizational structure (Chandler, 1962; Peterson, 1988). New strategy implementation require adjustment in the organizational structure that are more decentralized as they produce more successful strategy implementation regardless of strategic context. Different strategy types require different organizational structures hence necessitating change in the organizational structure for successful implementation of strategy.

2.4 Summary and Gaps to be filled by the study

In summary, the review indicates that researchers hold implicit and divided perspectives when they are examining various factors influencing the strategy implementation. Each of these perspectives has some empirical evidence to support. However, without comparing these factors in one single study, it remains unknown whether these perspectives are valid. Examining these perspectives is important as questionable conclusions could be drawn if underlying assumptions do not hold, and the intellectual development on strategy implementation could be seriously
affected as a result. Consequently, we undertake case studies to investigate the factors influencing strategy implementation in public universities in Kenya. The study therefore seeks to establish how the funding and top management commitment affects the success of strategy implementation in public universities in Kenya. The study further seeks to examine how the universities’ organizational change affects the success of strategy implementation. The study also seeks to identify how organizational structure of the public universities influences the success of strategy implementation. Finally the study seeks to determine the effects of organizational culture in the universities affect the success of strategy implementation.

2.5 Conceptual Framework
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Source: Researcher (2010)
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
In this chapter, the researcher describes the methods used and how the study was conducted. The chapter contains research design, population, sampling techniques, the data collection methods and the methods used in data analysis.

3.2 Research Design
The study adopted a descriptive research design. Cooper, (2000) states that descriptive research is concerned with finding out who, what, where and how of a phenomenon which is the concern of the study. The purpose of descriptive research is to describe, document aspects of a situation as it naturally occurs (Kothari, 1990). The researcher used descriptive design because it describes the state of affairs as it exists; no attempt is made to change the behavior or conditions, one measure things as they were. The purpose of using descriptive research was because it sought to obtain information that described exiting phenomena by asking individuals about the implementation of strategies.

3.3 The Target Population
The target population was the Fifty (50) Management staff of JKUAT. This was due to the fact that they are the key implementers of the strategies in the institution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Vice Chancellors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal of College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals of Campuses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrars</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Deans and Dean of students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Campus Directors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of Institutes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman’s and Head of Departments</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: JKUAT Statute, JKUAT strategic Plan 2009-2012, and JKUAT Staff Establishment 2010-2014

JKUAT is run by a Vice chancellor who is the Chief Executive assisted by Three Deputy Vice Chancellors that are in charge of Academic Affairs, Administration Planning and Development and Research, Production and Extension. The University has one Principal heading the College of Engineering and three Principals that are in charge of Karen, Taita Taveta and Nairobi Campuses.

The three Registrars assist respective Deputy Vice chancellors in the running of the day today activities of the Divisions. The Finance Officer is charge of University finances. The University has seven deans, three of whom are in the college of Engineering, one each in Faculty of Science, Faculty of Agriculture, School of Law and one dean of students. The two school directors head the School of Human Resource Development and School of Architectural and Building Science. The University has four Campuses in various cities of the country that are headed by Directors, they include, Nairobi CBD, Mombasa CBD, Kitale CBD and Nakuru CBD campuses.

The university has four academic institutes headed by Directors, they include Institute of Computer Science and Information Technology (ICSIT), Institute of Biotechnology Research (IBR), Institute of Energy and Environmental Technology (IEET), Institute of Tropical Medicine and infectious Diseases (ITROMID)

The University has twenty five academic and administrative departments as at September 2010. The Academic departments are headed by Chairpersons while administrative departments are
headed by Head of Departments. The departments are spread across Academic Affairs, administrative Planning and Development and Research Production and Extension.

3.4 Sample and Sampling Procedures

The study used census survey in which all the fifty (50) Management staff from the university was selected. These were the key implementers of the strategic plan and university policies.

3.5 Data Collection

The study used questionnaires to collect data. Orodho (2004), defines a questionnaire as an instrument used to gather data, which allows a measurement for or against a particular viewpoint. He emphasizes that a questionnaire has the ability to collect a large amount of information in a reasonably quick space of time. Prior to the actual data collection the researcher pre-tested the questionnaires to ensure that it yielded the needed data (Orodho, 2004). The ambiguous questions were corrected and the questionnaires given back to the same respondents to check if they yield the needed data. The researcher self administered the questionnaires to the respondents. This was also done to explain any part of the questionnaire that needed clarification. The questionnaires were filled and given back to the researcher. Where respondents were found to have no time, the researcher left the questionnaire behind to allow it to be completed.

3.6 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, measures of central tendency and inferential statistics were applied. The study used Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression analysis to measure the relationship between the variables. Presentation was done in pie charts, bar graphs and tables where necessary. Before analysis data was first edited to identify and eliminate errors made by respondents. Coding was then done to translate responses into specific categories. Code numbers were assigned to each answer of survey question and from there coding list or frame were obtained. The coded items were then analyzed with the aid of a computer on SPSS.
OLS regression model

\[ \text{Implementation of Strategy} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \epsilon_i \]

Where:

- Implementation of Strategy - Is the dependent variable
- $\beta_0$ - Is the constant
- $X_1$ - Top management commitment
- $X_2$ - Availability of funds
- $X_3$ - Organizational Change
- $X_4$ - Organizational structure
- $\epsilon_i$ - Is the residual error
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter data pertaining to: to establish the level of strategy implementation, identification of the organizational factors that have influenced this level of strategy implementation and identification of the external environmental factors influencing strategy implementation at JKUAT, is analyzed, interpreted and presented.

A total of 50 respondents were given questionnaires out of which 36 respondents successfully completed the questionnaires and returned to the researcher. This gave a response rate of 72 percent. The other respondents failed to complete the questionnaire citing lack of time, while others gave no reason for not completing the questionnaire.

Table 4.1: Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage -%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires successfully completed and Returned</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires Returned but not filled</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires Not Returned</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Questionnaires given out</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 General Information

In this section, the study sought to establish the respondents’ name (which was optional), gender, age bracket, level of education, designation and how long they have been in their current positions. The findings are presented in the subsequent sections.
4.1 Gender

Respondents were asked to indicate their genders. According to the results of the study in Figure 4.1, majority of the respondents (89%) were male as compared to female constituted only 11%. This indicates that the running of the University is mainly male dominated.

Figure 4.1: Distribution by Gender

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.2.2 Distribution by Age

To establish the age brackets which the respondents belonged, respondents were asked to state the age brackets they belonged. The study results in Figure 4.2 show that majority of the respondents (57%) were in the age bracket of 41 – 50 years while 33% were over 50 years old. This indicates that majority of the employees in the University are advanced in age and the succession management in the University may be described as poor.
4.2.3 Level of Education
The sought to establish the level of education of the respondents. Table 4.1 show that 20 (67%) respondents had PhDs while only 6 (20%) of the respondents had post graduate degrees and diplomas. The results show that only 4 (13%) respondents had first degrees. This is an indication that the information received was from highly learned people.

Table 4.2: Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First university degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate degree/diploma</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.2.4 Length of Time in Current Position
The study sought to establish how long the respondents had been in their current positions. According to the findings of the study in Figure 4.3, 70% of the respondents had been in their
current positions for less than 5 years. This indicates that the implementation of strategies in the university may be affected by the frequent change in the various departments in the University. The results show that 23% of the respondents have been in their current positions for over 13 years.

Figure 4.3: Length of Time in Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Interval</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>over 13 years</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10 years</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 years</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 5 years</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2010)

### 4.3: Strategy Implementation

In this section the study sought to establish the level of strategy implementation in JKUAT. The findings of the study are presented in the subsequent sections.

#### 4.3.1 University Apply Strategic Plan in Management

The study sought to establish whether the university applied strategic plan in its management. The results in Figure 4.4 show that 90% of the respondents indicated that the University indeed
applied strategic plan in its management. The results show that only 10% indicated that the University never applied strategic plan in management.

Figure 4.4: University Apply Strategic Plan in Management

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.3.2 Extent of Involvement in Strategy Implementation in University

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they were involved in the strategy implementation in the university. According to the findings of the study in Table 4.2, 13 (36%) indicated that they were involved in the implementation of the strategies to a large extent while the 11 (31%) were involved in the implementation to a moderate extent. The study results show that only one respondent was never involved in the implementation of strategies in the institution at all.

Table 4.3: Extent of Involvement in Strategy Implementation in University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small extent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large extent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very large extent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2010)
3.3 Strategies Implemented in area of Jurisdiction
Respondents were asked to list the number of strategies that had been implemented in their areas of jurisdiction. Respondents indicated that cost centers was introduced in their departments to improve financial management of the organization by making every department accountable. Respondents equally indicated that fees policies had been introduced in their areas of jurisdiction. According to the findings of the study, the institution had implemented objective staff evaluation strategy. Respondents equally indicated that the institution had implemented strategic plan besides academic quality assurance policy. The respondents indicated that the institution implemented the strategy to increase the number of admission by 10%. The study established that the University implemented the strategy which was aimed at improving linkages and partnership with the industry and other stakeholders. The institution according to the respondents implemented the strategy aimed at reducing the HIV infections. The respondents indicated that some of the strategies implemented by the institution included the signing of performance contract by its employees. The respondents indicated that the strategies implemented included the improvement of teaching and examination in the institution. Respondents also indicated that university implemented strategy to raise and sustain academic standards.

3.3.4 New Strategies that have Failed to be Implemented
Respondents were asked to indicate the strategies which the institution has failed to implement. According to respondents, the University failed to form tutorial groups for students. Respondents equally indicated that the University had failed to implement staff training policy. The university had according to the respondents failed to implement university charter and staff code of conduct and ethics. Respondents indicated that university-industry linkage strategy failed to be implemented. The study established that according to the respondents, the university has failed to implement e-learning strategy.
4.5 Extent of Strategy Implementation in the University

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the new strategies were implemented in the institution. The study results in Figure 4.5 show that 87% of the respondents described the implementation of new strategies in the institution as high. The results show that only 7% of the respondents described the implementation as low and 3% very low.

Figure 4.5: Extent of Strategy Implementation in the University

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.4 Organizational Factors that have influenced the Level of Strategy Implementation

In this section the study sought to establish the organizational factors that have influenced the level of strategy implementation in JKUAT. The findings of the study are presented in the subsequent sections.

4.4.1 Extent the Factors have Contributed to Implementation of Strategic Plan

The study sought to establish the extent to which the listed factors had contributed to the implementation of strategic plan at the University. According to the results presented in Table 4.3, 40% of the respondents indicated that allocation of adequate funding contributed to the
implementation of strategic plan at the University to a large extent while 30% indicated that it had contributed only to a moderate extent. The results show that 37% of the respondents indicated that timely distribution of allocated funds contributed to the strategic plan implementation to a large extent while 27% indicated that this was so only to a moderate extent. The results of the study show that 17% of the respondents indicated that timely distribution of allocated funds affected strategy implementation to a very large extent. The results of the study show that 40% of the respondents believed that top management commitment affected the implementation of strategy to a large extent while 23% indicated that these was so to a very large extent. The study results show that 30% of the respondents indicated that the top management commitment affected the strategic plan implementation to a moderate extent. The study established that most respondents (40%) indicated that staff resistance to change effected the implementation of the strategy to a moderate extent. According to the results 27% of the respondents indicated that staff resistance to change affected the implementation to a large extent. 23% of the respondents believed that the resistance to change by employees affected the implementation of the strategy only to a small extent.

Table 4.4: Extent the Factors have Contributed to Implementation of Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of adequate funding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely distribution of allocated funds</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management commitment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff resistance to change</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2010)
4.4.2 Funding of New Strategy at JKUAT
Respondents were asked to describe the extent of funding of new strategies at the University. The results of the study in Figure 4.6 show that majority of the respondents (60%) described the extent of funding of new strategies in the institution as low while 37% described it as high. This explains why there is a high failure rate of strategy implementation in the university.

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.4.3 Top Management Commitment to Successful Implementation of New Strategies
The study sought to establish the level of commitment of the top management to the successful implementation of new strategies in the university. According to Table 4.4, 50% of the respondents indicated that the top management was committed to successful implementation of new strategies in the institution to a large extent while 37% indicated that this was so only to a moderate extent. The study results show that 7% of the respondents indicated that the management was committed to a very large extent. These findings agree with the view of Lewis et al (2003) and Wixon and Watson (2001) that the top management commitment significantly affected the user beliefs (e.g. perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness).
Table 4.5: Top Management Commitment to Successful Implementation of New Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small extent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large extent</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very large extent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.4.4 Success/Failure of Strategy Implementation Attributed to Adequate Allocation of Resources

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they attributed the level of Success/failure of new strategy implementation to adequate allocation of resources. The results of the study show that according to 50% of the respondents, the success/failure of strategy implementation was attributed to adequate allocation of resources to a large extent while 27% of the respondents indicated that adequate allocation of resources determined the success/failure of the implementation to a moderate extent. The study results show that 20% of the respondents indicated that adequate allocation of funds affected the strategy implementation to a very large extent.
4.4.5 Success/Failure of Strategy Implementation Attributed to Visionary Leadership

The study sought to establish the effect of visionary leadership on the success/failure to implementation of new strategy in the institution. The results show that according to 53% of the respondents (see Figure 4.8) visionary leadership in the strategy implementation influenced the success/failure to a large extent while 23% indicated that the influence was to a very large extent.

Source: Research Data (2010)
4.4.6 Top Leadership of University Affected Successful Strategy Implementation

The study sought to establish the extent to which the top leadership of the institution had affected the successful implementation of new strategies. The results in Figure 4.10 show that 40% of the respondents indicated that the top leadership had affected the successful implementation of new strategies to a moderate extent while 37% indicated that the top management of the institution had affected the implementation to a large extent and 17% to a very large extent. The study results agreed with views of Cuimareas and Igbaria (1997) and Igbaria et al (1997) that there is a direct and linear relationship between top management commitment and implementation outcome.

Figure 4.9: Top Leadership of University Affected Successful Strategy Implementation

![Graph showing distribution of respondents by leadership affectedness](image)

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.5 Environmental Factors that have Influenced Strategy Implementation

In this section, the study sought to find out the external environmental factors that have influenced strategy implementation at JKUAT. The results are presented in the subsequent sections.
4.5.1 New Strategy Implementation Face Resistance

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the new strategy implementation had faced resistance in the institution. According to the results of the study presented in Table 4.5, 58% of the respondents indicated that strategy implementation had faced resistance only to a moderate extent while 22% indicated that the new strategy implementation had faced resistance to a large extent. The study results show that 17% of the respondents indicated that there was resistance only to a small extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small extent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large extent</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.5.2 Common Reasons for Resistance to Strategy Implementation

The study sought to establish the most common reasons for strategy implementation resistance. Respondents indicated that resistance has been caused by fear of the unknown among the employees has been blamed for the resistance as some employees feel that the new strategy will render them redundant due to lack of skills. Respondents indicated that the resistance has been experienced due to lack of information about the benefits of the new strategy. Respondents indicated that most of the new strategies have been forced on the employees by the top management as they practiced top down strategic plan development and implementation.
4.5.3 Success of Change Management by University Management

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the university management had been successful in management of change in the institution. The study results in Table 4.6 show that 18 (50%) respondents indicated that university management was successful in management of change to a moderate extent while 14 (44%) indicated that the management was successful in change management to a large extent.

Table 4.7: Success of Change Management by University Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large extent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.5.4 University Identify and Evaluate Individual Employee Attitude

The study sought to establish the extent to which the University identified and evaluated the attitudes of individual employees and workers union officials with the aim of finding out their needs, beliefs, values and interests. The study results presented in Figure 4.11 show that 40% of the respondents indicated that the university identified and evaluated the attitude of its employees and union officials only to a small extent. The study show that 30% of the respondents indicated that employee attitudes were identified and evaluated to a moderate extent while 27% indicated that this was done to a very large extent. Though these findings may be supporting Kazmi (2008) view that top management should overcome employee resistance to change by identifying and evaluating employee resistance to change by identifying and evaluating the attitudes of individual employees and influential groups as most of the respondents indicated that the consultations were done only to a small extent.
4.5.5 Change Management in University

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the university management had employed the lost factors to manage change in the organization. The results show that 50% of the respondents indicated that the institution had employed training to manage change to a large extent which 27% indicated that training was only used to a moderate extent. The findings of the study support Ross et al (1999) and Stratman and Roth (1999) argument that training offered good opportunities to help employees to adjust to the changes that have been introduced by the system and help build positive attitude towards the system. The study results show that 40% of the respondents indicated that the institution had employed capacity building as a change management tool to a large extent while 37% indicated that capacity building was used to manage change to a moderate extent. According to the results of the study, 50% of the respondents indicated that communication was employed by the institution management to manage change to a moderate extent while 30% indicating that communication was used to a large extent. The study established that workshops and seminars were used to a large extent while according to 33% of the respondents, the workshops and seminars were used only to a moderate extent.
4.5.6 Influence of University Organs in the Implementation of Strategy

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the listed organs in the university had influenced the implementation of strategy. According to the findings of the study as presented in Figure 4.13, show that 50% of the respondents indicated that the workers union influenced the success or failure of strategy implementation in the institution to a large extent while according to 33%, the influence of the workers union was to a moderate extent. The study results show that 57% of the respondents indicated that the student unions influenced the implementation to a moderate extent. The study findings support Williams (1982) view that the endorsement and support of well known individuals and opinion leaders is very important in the successful implementation of a new strategy as the support of the leader of the influential group is sought. The study show that 43% of the respondents indicated that the Ministry of Higher Education Science and Technology influenced the success or failure of strategy implementation in the university to a large extent while according to 30% of the respondents, the influence of the ministry was only to a moderate extent. The study results show that 50% of the respondents
indicated that the Commission of Higher Education influenced the implementation of strategy in the institution to a moderate extent.

Figure 4.12: Influence of University Organs in the Implementation of Strategy

Source: Research Data (2010)

5.7 Receptiveness of the University to New Strategy

Respondents were asked to describe the university’s institutional culture in terms of its receptiveness to new strategies. The study results in Figure 4.15 show that 50% of the respondents described the institutional culture to new strategies as good while 40% described it as fair.

Figure 4.13: Receptiveness of the University to New Strategy

Source: Research Data (2010)
4.5.8 University Forced to Change the Institutional Culture to Fit New Strategy

The study sought to establish the extent to which the university had been forced to change the institutional culture to fit the new strategy. According to 57% of the respondents, the university had been forced to change its institutional culture to a moderate extent while 30% of the respondents indicated that the university changed its institutional culture to accommodate new strategy to a moderate extent.

Figure 4.14: University Forced to Change the Institutional Culture to Fit New Strategy

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.5.9 University Used Listed Factors to Change Institutional Culture

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the institution had used the listed factors to change the culture to fit the new strategy. According to Table 4.7, 43% of the respondents indicated that the university used recruitment to change the culture of the institution to fit the new strategy to a moderate extent while according to 40% of the respondents indicated that the institution had used training to a large extent. The study established that 47% of the respondents indicated that the university used promotions and restructuring of the organization to moderate extent to change the culture of the University for the Implementation of new strategies. According to 43% of the respondents indicated that the university employed transfers to moderate extent to bring change into the institution for new strategies to fit.
Table 4.8: University Used Listed Factors to Change Institutional Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No extent (%)</th>
<th>Small extent (%)</th>
<th>Moderate extent (%)</th>
<th>Large extent (%)</th>
<th>Very large extent (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring and org.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.5.10 Organizational Structure of JKUAT

Respondents were asked to describe the structure of JKUAT. The study shows that 40% of respondents described the structure of the institution as top down while according to 27%, the structure of the institution is centralized.

Figure 4.15: Organizational Structure of JKUAT

Source: Research Data (2010)
4.5.11 University Changed Organizational Structure to Ensure Successful Implementation of Strategy

The study sought to establish the extent to which the university had changed organizational structure to ensure successful implementation of the strategy. The study shows that 63% of the respondents indicated that the university changed its structure to ensure successful implementation of the strategy to a moderate extent. The results of the study show that only 27% of the respondents indicated that the institution had changed the organizational structure to a large extent. The study findings are in agreement with Chandler (1962) and Perterson (1988) that the success of any strategy depends on its fit with the organizational structure which demanded that the implementing organization change to ensure it fits.

Figure 4.16: University Changed Organizational Structure

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.5.12 Areas Changed to Ensure Successful Strategy Implementation

Respondents were asked to list the areas that the university had changed to ensure successful implementation of its strategies. The respondents indicated that the university through the deans appointed part-time lecturers to ensure that the increases intake of students succeeded. Respondents equally indicated that the university created new divisions/directorates such as the DAQA and DIPCA. Respondents also indicated that the institution changed its structure through restructuring of PRE. The respondents indicated that the University opened more campuses to accommodate more students such as the launch of engineering college.
4.5.13 Change of Organizational Structure Determines Success of Strategy Implementation

Respondents were asked to state whether they agreed with the statement that change in organizational structure determined the success of the implementation of new strategy. According to the majority of the respondents (67%), they agreed with the statement that change in the organizational structure determined the success of the implementation of new strategy.

**Table 4.9: Change of Organizational Structure Determines Success of Strategy Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2010)

4.5.14 Political Influence on the Implementation of New Strategy at JKUAT

Respondents were asked to describe the extent to which there was political influence in the implementation of new strategies in the institution. The study results in Figure 4.19, 50% of the respondents described the political influence as high while the same proportion described the influence as low.
4.6 Regression Analysis

In this section the study presents the OLS regression results. OLS regression was done to determine the relationship between the factors affecting implementation of strategies i.e. top management commitment, availability of funds, organizational change, organizational structure, and organizational culture. The model is represented by:

$$\text{Implementation of Strategy} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \epsilon$$

Where:

- Implementation of Strategy - Is the dependent variable
- $\beta_0$ - Is the constant
- $X_1$ - Top management commitment
- $X_2$ - Availability of funds
- $X_3$ - Organizational Change
- $X_4$ - Organizational structure
- $\epsilon$ - Is the residual error
Table 4.10: Model Summary – Coefficient of Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.643(a)</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.36891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), university organization structure, top leadership of the university commitment, organizational change, timely distribution of allocated funds

The results of the study indicate that the value of R squared is 0.414. This implies that independent variables (top management commitment, organizational structure, availability of funds, and external influence) explain 41% of the dependent variable (successful implementation of environmental audit). The regression equation appears useful for making predictions since the value of $r^2$ explains a significant portion (41%) of environmental audit implementation.

Table 4.11: ANOVA(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.788</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>5.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3.947</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.735</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), university organization structure, top leadership of the university commitment, organizational change, timely distribution of allocated funds

b Dependent Variable: New strategy implemented successfully
### Coefficients(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely allocated funds</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership of the university commitment</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational change</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University changed the organization structure to fit new strategy</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: New strategy implemented successfully

The study results show that 95% level of significance, most of the p-values are less than 0.05. This means that the test is to some extent statistically significant. The study results show that F statistics is statistically significant (p value < 5). The results of the regression analysis show that all the beta values are positive except top management commitment. This means that an increase in timely allocation of funds, organizational structural and organizational change leads to the success implementation of new strategy. On the other hand the results mean that an increase in top management commitment to strategy implementation leads to a decline in the success of new strategy implementation. This finding contradicts the expected outcome as it is expected the increased top management commitment should result into a successful strategy implementation.

The regression equation can be represented as:

Successful implementation of new strategy = 2.136 + 0.069 Timely funds allocation - 0.271 Top management commitment + 0.247 Organizational change + 0.031 Organizational structure
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Introduction
This chapter summarizes the findings of the study pertaining to data pertaining to the level of strategy implementation, the organizational factors that have influenced this level of strategy implementation and the external environmental factors that have influenced strategy implementation at JKUAT. Conclusions based on the findings are then made and thereafter recommendations for management and suggestion for future study are presented.

5.2 Summary of Findings
According to the results of the study, majority of the respondents (90%) indicated that the institution applied strategic plan in its management. The study established that the employees (33%) were largely involved in the implementation of strategies in the university. The strategies which were implemented in the institution included the introduction of cost centers in the various department in the institution, the adoption of objective staff evaluations and academic quality assurance. The study established that the university increased the number of admission by 10%. According to the respondents, the university aimed at improving the linkages and partnership with the industry and other stakeholders to ensure that it produced graduates who were relevant to the job market. Of the implemented strategies, respondents indicated that the cost center did not succeed. The study established that the university failed to implement staff training policy. Respondents equally indicated that the institution did not succeed in implementing university-industry linkage. Despite failures, 87% of the respondents indicated that the strategy implementation in the institution was high.

The study results revealed that allocation of adequate funds was according to 40% of respondents a major factor which largely influenced the implementation of strategies in the institution. The results further revealed that timely distribution of allocated resources (37%) was equally a major factors which largely influenced the strategy implementation. The same was with the top management commitment to the implementation of the strategies as was indicated by 40% of the
respondents. The study established that according to 58% of the respondents, the funds allocation for new strategies was described as low with only 37% describing it as high. The study established that according to 50% of the respondents, the management was to a large extent committed to successful implementation of new strategies. According to the findings of the study, 53% indicated that the success or failure of strategy implementation was largely dependent on visionary leadership of the institution.

The study established that the factors which hindered the successful strategy implementation was resistance as was indicated by 60% of the respondents. The main reasons given for resistance were fear of the unknown and the lack of information on the benefits of change. The study established that the most of the respondents described the change management in the institution as successful (53% moderate extent and 40% large extent). Though the university identified and evaluated individual employee attitude, this was not satisfactory as 40% indicated that this was so only to a small extent. The study used training (50%) capacity building (40%) and workshops and seminars (43%) to manage change. The university receptiveness to new strategies was described as good by 50% of the respondents. The study further established that the university forced change on the institutional culture to fit new strategy (57%). The organizational structure of the university was described as top down by 40% of the respondents. The results of the study also revealed that the institution had changed it structure to fit new strategy while according to 77% of the respondents, change of organizational structure influenced the success of strategy implementation.

5.3 Conclusions

The study established that the organization adopted new strategies to a large extent. Though it experienced a few failures in strategy implementation, the level of success was described by respondents as high. The study established that allocation of adequate funds, and its timely distribution and top management commitment affected the implementation of strategies in the institution. Despite its importance, the funds allocation for strategy implementation was described as low by respondents. The top management of the University was committed to the implementation of new strategies. The study revealed that the institution was faced with
resistance to change by some of its employees which it overcame by training its employees and through workshops and seminars. The university forced changes in its institutional and structure and culture to fit the new strategy.

5.4 Recommendations

The study established that though the university was successful in implementation of most of the strategies, it failed in the implementation of some important strategies such as university-industry link and staff training policy. The study recommends that the institution develop strategies that will ensure success of future strategy implementation.

The study established that the major factors which influenced strategy implementation were inadequate allocation of funds and resistance to change. The study therefore recommends that the institution allocate adequate resources for successful implementation of new strategies. The study also recommends that the institution adopt modern methods of change management which will ensure minimal resistance is experienced in strategy implementation.

The study established that political influence was found to be a factor that influenced the implementation of new strategies in the university. The study recommends that running of public universities be made autonomous devoid of any political interference.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

This study was only done in the Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology only while there are other organizations which implement new strategies in their management. The study therefore recommends that similar studies be carried out in other institutions of learning and other public organizations with an aim of establishing factor which affect the implementation of strategies in organizations.
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APPENDIX 1: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

August , 2010

Dear Respondent,

REQUEST FOR RESEARCH DATA

I am a Master of Business Administration (MBA) student at Kenyatta University. I am required to submit as part of my course work assessment, a research project report on **factors influencing strategy implementation in public universities in Kenya: the case of Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JCUAT)**. I am kindly requesting you to assist me in this study by filling the attached questionnaire to the best of your ability as it applies to your institution.

Please be assured that the information you provide will be used solely for academic purposes and all responses will remain confidential.

Thank you very much for your time.

Titus Wasike,
Student researcher
**APPENDIX 2: QUESTIONNAIRE**

**SECTION 1: GENERAL INFORMATION**

1. Name of the respondent (optional)

2. Gender
   - Male [ ]
   - Female [ ]

3. Age bracket
   - Below 25 years [ ]
   - 25 – 30 years [ ]
   - 31 – 40 years [ ]
   - 41 – 50 years [ ]
   - Over 50 years [ ]

4. Level of Education
   - First University degree [ ]
   - Post graduate degree/diploma [ ]
   - PhD [ ]
   - Others specify ____________________________

5. Designation ____________________________

6. How long have you been in your current position?
   - Less than 5 years [ ]
   - 5 – 7 years [ ]
   - 8 – 10 years [ ]
   - 11 – 13 years [ ]
   - Over 13 years [ ]

**SECTION 2: STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION**

7. Does the University apply the strategic plan in its management?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

8. To what extent have you been involved in any strategy implementation in the University?
   - No extent [ ]
   - Small extent [ ]
   - Moderate extent [ ]
   - Large extent [ ]
   - Very large extent [ ]
9. List number of strategies that have been implemented in your area of jurisdiction
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 
   d. 
   e. 

10 List number of new strategies that have **failed** to be implemented in your area of jurisdiction
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 
   d) 
   e) 

11 With scale of 1 to 4 where 4 is equivalent to extremely high, 3 High, 2 Low and 1 Extremely low, How would you describe the extent of new strategy implementation at JKUAT?
   
   Extremely High    [  ]
   High              [  ]
   Low               [  ]
   Extremely Low     [  ]

4. SECTION 3: ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS THAT HAVE INFLUENCED THE LEVEL OF STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

12 Number of factors may have contributed to implementation of strategic plan in JKUAT. For each of the following factors indicates the extent to which each has contributed:

   i  Allocation of adequate Funding
      No extent    [  ]
      Small extent [  ]
      Moderate extent [  ]
      Large extent [  ]
      Very large extent [  ]
ii  Timely distribution of allocated Funds
   No extent  [ ]
   Small extent [ ]
   Moderate extent [ ]
   Large extent  [ ]
   Very large extent [ ]

iii Top Management commitment
   No extent  [ ]
   Small extent [ ]
   Moderate extent [ ]
   Large extent  [ ]
   Very large extent [ ]

iv Staff resistance to change
   No extent  [ ]
   Small extent [ ]
   Moderate extent [ ]
   Large extent  [ ]
   Very large extent [ ]

13 With scale of 1 to 4 where 4 is equivalent to extremely high, 3 High, 2 Low and 1 extremely low, How would you describe the extent of funding of new strategies at JKUAT?
   Extremely High  [ ]
   High  [ ]
   Low  [ ]
   Extremely Low [ ]

14 To what extent is the top management committed to the successful implementation of new strategies at JKUAT?
   No extent  [ ]
   Small extent [ ]
   Moderate extent [ ]
   Large extent  [ ]
   Very large extent [ ]
15 To what extent would you attribute the level of success/failure of new strategy implementation to adequate allocation of resources?

   No extent [ ]
   Small extent [ ]
   Moderate extent [ ]
   Large extent [ ]
   Very large extent [ ]

16 To what extent would you attribute the level of success/failure of new strategy implementation to visionary leadership?

   No extent [ ]
   Small extent [ ]
   Moderate extent [ ]
   Large extent [ ]
   Very large extent [ ]

17. To what extent do you think top leadership of the University has affected successful implementations of new strategies.

   No extent [ ]
   Small extent [ ]
   Moderate extent [ ]
   Large extent [ ]
   Very large extent [ ]

5. SECTION 4: ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS THAT HAVE INFLUENCED STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

18 To what extent does the new strategy implementation at JKUAT face resistance?

   No extent [ ]
   Small extent [ ]
   Moderate extent [ ]
   Large extent [ ]
   Very large extent [ ]
19 What are some of the most common reasons for resistance to introduction of new strategies or (change)?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 
   d. 
   e. 

20 To what extent does the university management been successful in managing change?
   No extent [ ]
   Small extent [ ]
   Moderate extent [ ]
   Large extent [ ]
   Very large extent [ ]

21 To what extent does the university identify and evaluate the attitudes of individual employees and workers union officials to find out their needs, beliefs, values and interest?
   No extent [ ]
   Small extent [ ]
   Moderate extent [ ]
   Large extent [ ]
   Very large extent [ ]

22 State the extent to which the university management has employed the following to manage change on a scale of 1 – 5 where 1 is equivalent to no extent, 2 - small extent, 3 - moderate extent, 4 - large extent and 5 - very large extent

   1 2 3 4 5
   Training [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
   Capacity building [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
   Communication [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
   Workshop and seminars [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

23 On a scale of 1 – 5 where 1 is equivalent to no extent, 2 - small extent, 3 - moderate extent, 4 - large extent and 5 - very large extent, State the extent to which the following
organs have influenced success/failure of implementation of new strategies in the University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workers Unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s Unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (MOHEST)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission of High Education (CHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 How would you describe the institutional culture of the university in terms of receptiveness to new strategies?

- Very good  [ ]
- Good       [ ]
- Fair       [ ]
- Bad        [ ]
- Very bad   [ ]

25 To what extent has the university been forced to change the institutional culture to fit a new strategy?

- No extent   [ ]
- Small extent [ ]
- Moderate extent [ ]
- Large extent [ ]
- Very large extent [ ]

26 State the extent to which the institution has used the following to change the culture to fit the new strategy on a five a point likert scale where 1 is equivalent to no extent, 2 - small extent, 3 - moderate extent, 4 - large extent and 5 - very large extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring and organization design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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27. How would you describe the structure of JKUAT?

Customer oriented    [  ]
Bottom up            [  ]
Top down             [  ]
Centralized          [  ]
Decentralized        [  ]

28. To what extent has the university changed the structure of the organization to ensure successful implementation of the strategy?

No extent     [  ]
Small extent  [  ]
Moderate extent [  ]
Large extent  [  ]
Very large extent [  ]

29. List such areas that the University changed the organization structure for purposes of successful implementation of its strategies

a) 

b) 

c) 

d) 

e) 

30. Do you agree with the statement that change of organization structure determines successful implementation of new strategies?

Strongly Agree[  ]    Agree [  ]    Disagree [  ]    Strongly Disagree    [  ]

31. With scale of 1 to 4 where 4 is equivalent to extremely high, 3 High, 2 Low and 1 Extremely low, How would you describe the extent of political influence of the university council in implementation of new strategy at JKUAT?

Extremely High [  ]
High [  ]
Low [  ]
Extremely Low [  ]

Thank you, God Bless.
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### APPENDIX 3: RESEARCH BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COST (KSHS)</th>
<th>KSHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Writing Materials</td>
<td>5,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Typing of Proposal</td>
<td>3,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Typing of final report</td>
<td>5,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Printing services</td>
<td>5,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Proposal spiral binding</td>
<td>1,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Final report binding</td>
<td>3,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Computer Services</td>
<td>8,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Data analysis</td>
<td>10,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;-30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing of study topic</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconnaissance</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of research proposal</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and compilation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing of the report and presentation of report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Submission of Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>